

Bryn Mawr College Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

1971

Review of *ANATHEMATA: Studien zu den Weihgeschenken strengen Stils im Heiligtum von Olympia*, by Felix Eckstein

Brunilde S. Ridgway

Bryn Mawr College, bridgway@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs



Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1971. Review of *ANATHEMATA: Studien zu den Weihgeschenken strengen Stils im Heiligtum von Olympia*, by Felix Eckstein. *American Journal of Archaeology* 75:342-343.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/81

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

(fig. 1) shows the relationship of the cella east anta and two stones of the *se* "peristasis": two of four stones roughly parallel to the front of the temple. A narrow row of small stones is identified as part of the peristyle foundation on the *ne* flank. These lines of stones resemble the "retaining wall" 2.00 m. *ne* of and nearly parallel to the flank of the temple. This wall was built when the 8th century structures were leveled out to form a terrace for the 7th century temple. If there had been a wooden peristyle, one should expect a series of flat slabs for column bases, as at Thermon in Temple B.

In his restoration, Auberson's use of "the Ionic foot" (0.349 m.) is misleading, since no architectural historians agree on this ancient unit of measure. For example, Dinsmoor calculates an Ionic foot of 0.2943 m. from the 4th century temple at Didyma (*The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 222 n. 2), while Gruben suggests a foot length of 0.3286 m. for Hera Temple I at Samos (*Die Tempel der Griechen*, 318). In order to make his Ionic foot fit the dimensions of the foundations, Auberson takes all measurements from the axes or centers of walls, following the theory that Ionic buildings were designed in terms of axial alignment. This may have been true of the design (if there were any columns to be aligned here), but the building specifications must have been written to guide laborers who built walls from end to end and measured from finished surfaces. Auberson admits the seventh century hecatompedon would be almost exactly 100 Ionic feet in length, if one measured from the outer edge of the foundations (34.80 m.), but this violates his system of axial measurement. Actually the foundations are too little preserved to bear such a detailed restoration. Only the length of the cella can be measured within a 10-20 cm. tolerance.

Although nothing remains of the superstructure, Auberson calls the 7th century temple "Ionic," because of the resemblance of the restored plan to Hecatompedon II at Samos. Ceramic evidence indicates the terrace below the temple was built in the first quarter of the century and Auberson dates the temple about a decade later, 670-650 B.C.

The foundations of the 6th century temple are fairly well preserved, although none of the finished blocks remain. No new fragments of superstructure have been found in the recent Swiss excavations, so one must be content with a piece of a Doric capital, two broken triglyphs, a corner acroterion base, and a fragment of a geison block. The acroterion base, which provoked the controversy over restoring a "Chinese roof" at Eretria, has not been restudied by Auberson. The two triglyphs are finely drawn, but the bit of geison block is mentioned only in a footnote. In a clean drawing at 1:5 scale, the profile of the Doric capital is compared with capitals from the temples of Apollo at Corinth, Delphi, Aegina, and the Old Athena Temple on the Acropolis at Athens. No photographs are given of these architectural elements.

The building remains are clearly described, and the drawing seems accurate when examined on the site.

The 1:50 scale, actual state plan was printed slightly undersized (foundation length and width measure 1-2% less than the printed dimensions); unfortunately, the 10 m. scale in the bottom left corner was added afterwards at exactly 1:50 scale, and consequently it cannot be used to check dimensions on the plan.

Working from the remains of the foundations of cella walls and interior colonnade, Auberson convincingly restores the 6th century temple. The peristyle with 6 x 14 columns fits equally well. However, on the foundations there are no setting lines for the euthynteria blocks, so the extreme dimensions of the temple cannot be exactly known.

Auberson presents a section drawing of the foundation (fig. 3 at 1:20 scale) and restores the step blocks, each about 0.33 m. high. In the outer edge of the stylobate foundation stones there is clearly a cutting for the bed of the second step. However, the foundations are not as uniformly built as ashlar masonry, and since no levels are given on the state plan, one cannot know whether this cutting is regularly at the same height above the euthynteria foundation course. This is a crucial measurement, since it is the basis for Auberson's identification of the "Pheidonian" foot of 0.327 m. (Dinsmoor's "Doric" foot, *Architecture*, 72 n. 1) as the ancient unit of measure for the 6th century temple. His second indicator, the triglyph width, 0.645 m., is slightly less than two Doric feet. The interior dimensions of the temple may be expressed in Doric feet, but these dimensions cannot be accurately measured. Unfortunately, the length and width of the stylobate and euthynteria, though restored within a tolerance of about 5 cm., are not even closely divisible by a Doric foot. Clearly one needs more information to determine the builder's yardstick (forthcoming appendix by Oscar Broneer to his publication of the archaic temple of Poseidon at Isthmia).

Yet in general, this is a clear and well-written report. The photographs of the foundations are excellent, the drawings are admirably neat and accurate, and the text is free of typeset errors. One may argue with Auberson's restorations, but his methods are correct and the results are thought provoking.

W. WILLSON CUMMER

AMERICAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE IN TURKEY, ANKARA

ANAOHMATA. STUDIEN ZU DEN WEIHGESCHENKEN STRENGEN STILS IM HEILIGTUM VON OLYMPIA, by *Felix Eckstein*. Pp. 139, figs. 24, pls. 4 (line drawings), text ill. (drawings) 24. Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin 1969.

Traditionally, we approach Greek sculpture either from the philological angle trying to match ancient sources with extant monuments, or through an examination of statuary in museums. There is a definite need for a third approach, that of studying sculpture in its original setting. How rewarding this study can

be is now shown by F. Eckstein's book—even within the limited range of its focus.

The author has selected eight dedications ranging in date from the early 5th century to ca. 450 B.C., all of which are lost to us as works of sculpture but survive in their fragmentary bases and inscriptions. He has listed them in the order in which Pausanias mentioned them in his tour of Olympia—all but the last (Praxiteles' dedication) which the periegetes did not see. This arrangement does not correspond to the chronological sequence but provides interesting sidelights on topography; it is all the more regrettable that a general plan of the site with the monuments marked was not provided in this otherwise well-documented book, nor was the north marked on the individual drawings, which would have greatly facilitated their reading.

The pedestals range from the simple rectangular base to the long stepped podium and finally to the curved *bathron*. Eckstein suggests that the simple paratactic alignment of archaic statues gradually developed into more complex arrangements which tended to eliminate the "dead" views of former displays in favor of more three-dimensional settings. The bases, in other words, became integral parts of the monuments; they secured specific viewpoints or forced the spectator to inspect the composition from a broader range of positions. This development, according to Eckstein, took two forms: either new arrangements were found for the individual components of a group on a long rectangular base, or the shape of the base itself was altered to conform to the new spatial concepts. Specifically, the curved or semicircular pedestal was an innovation of the Severe Period upon which later times could not improve.

This general statement is obviously valid, and fully in keeping with the evidence of extant Severe statues, both originals and copies. In many ways, and especially in its spatial interests, the Severe Period links with the Hellenistic across the gap provided by the classical interlude. Yet, though more complex arrangements were mastered early in the 5th century, the purely paratactic archaic solution was never abandoned. One should perhaps stress the many factors which may have prompted its repeated choice: the nature of the group, for instance (honorary as against mythological or narrative), or, to a more limited extent, a location along a road.

Some reservations should also be made for specific applications or exemplifications of Eckstein's conclusions. A typical example of what he calls the "articulated rectangle" is Phormis' dedication (no. 5), a long stepped pedestal of even width, where the author visualizes ten bronze statues in a pattern of alternating parallels and perpendiculars. A central group of Phormis fighting against an opponent would be arranged inwise, while two more duels would flank it lengthwise, with the fighters in traditional position parallel to the front. The whole tripartite scene would then be enclosed at either end by a horse and groom arranged in depth, with the horses facing

forward and providing, as it were, two enveloping wings to the composition. This arrangement is intriguing and plausible, though perhaps quite hypothetical on the basis of the extant remains. It may also be at variance with Pausanias' description, which I still read as referring to different dedications: the horses and men, in bronze, by Phormis, and three groups of duelists by Lykortas, of unspecified material. On this particular monument Eckstein's arguments are ingenious but not entirely safe, as he himself admits.

More evidence remains on other cases, especially in that extraordinary dedication of the Achaians (no. 3): nine Homeric heroes on a curved pedestal facing Nestor standing on his own base 12 m. away. In this case both Pausanias' description and the extant blocks conjure up the same picture which, however, in its bold handling of the spatial problem, remains unparalleled in antiquity. More conventional, nos. 1 and 4 (the Apollonian dedication and Mikythos' base) employ either the single semicircle or a Π -shaped pedestal with figures standing diagonally on the inner corner blocks.

The second part of Eckstein's book deals with dedications in the broader sense of votive offerings, not freestanding in their own setting but placed within the larger frame of a temple. To this purpose he has meticulously analyzed the stylobate and pronaos blocks of both the Zeus and the Hera temple, supplementing in many ways the earlier drawings of the two buildings. Several marks are difficult to interpret, but an interesting suggestion is that the many deep square cuttings in the intercolumniations of the Zeus temple were for the erection of poles supporting monumental trophies, presumably dedicated by the Western Greeks after their victories over Phoenicians and Etruscans, therefore in the Severe Period. Another provocative hypothesis is Eckstein's interpretation of the "footprints" of bronze statues in the central intercolumniations of the same building. These are all grouped along the south side and the author assumes, on technical grounds, that they were moved there for safekeeping during the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., perhaps at the time of the Herulian threat.

A different, less monumental tradition is suggested by the cuttings in the Hera temple, which predominantly housed marble and bronze stelai, decrees, and votive pinakes dedicated by the winners in the female races. Surprising for "a relatively early" period are the two small statues which must once have stood against the two central columns of the east façade (p. 96).

A brief review cannot do justice to the many points raised by Eckstein's work. Chronology, topography, cult practices and various problems of architecture and sculpture are touched upon and deserve more thorough discussion. But the book is a mine of technical information on the Olympia stones, and one hopes that this interpretative effort will be followed by many others along similar lines.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE